

taxpayers. There's not going to be any more money for Lexington down the road, it's just that they get their money a year sooner. So I would hope that you would consider this as a fairness issue and if you look at this chart that was passed out and you see that your school is losing money, they're not losing money, they're just losing it a year earlier than they would normally receive it. I've talked to Tim Kemper. He said dollarwise it's not going to make a dime difference in the long run, I suppose, unless you figured interest, it's not going to make any difference in the long run to any school. You'll all receive the amount of money due you depending on your enrollment. It's just a question of when. And this accelerates the rapid growth districts. It accelerates their funding so they get their money a year in advance. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to try and answer this. I know Senator Withem understands the issue better than I do. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LB 1138 and LB 1138A. The next speaker is Senator Schimek. Did you wish to address this again? Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Schrock, would you yield to a couple of questions at this time?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I will.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One of the reasons I divided the questions, I just wanted to make sure that the body understood what was happening. I hadn't really taken a position whether I was going to support or not this particular portion, the third part of the Lamb amendment, but I began asking some questions about how much would the shift be and what effect would it have. You made a comment that no one will win or lose. I guess I'm going to ask the question, in the short term, would that be a...is that a totally fair statement to make? In the short term, when I look at the sheet and I see 34 gainers and the rest lose as far as money, in the short term, that it's not accurate to say that no one loses I think, but you're referring to the long term, I am assuming, that when the monies would actually kick in the way the bill is written now on the 1059, that shift would occur and so, in the long term, that shift would take place